FRECK, SUSAN

From:

SCHEER, JERRY

Sent:

To:

Wednesday, January 13, 1999 5:12 PM
VAN HOLT, KEITH; ROEDER, ALLAN; MORRIS, WILLIAM; LAMM, DONALD; MUNOZ,
ERNESTO; ULLMAN, MURIEL; VALANTINE, PERRY; FRECK, SUSAN; DAROCA, ANDREA
Surplus Real Property - Hamilton St./Park Bonds

Subject:

To All: I have again spoken with outside bond counsel, Stan Wolcott. I am satisfied that the sale of the subject property may proceed. I anticipate receipt of Mr. Wolcott's opinion report in a few days and I will provide everyone with a copy of same for your file. There is no need to wait for the report as it will simply document the conclusion reached by Mr. Wolcott and provide the findings which support his legal opinion. Jerry.....

RUTAN & TUCKER, LLP

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

A PARTNERSHIP INCLUDING PROFESSIONAL CORPORATIONS

611 ANTON BOULEVARD, SUITE 1400

COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA 92626-1998

DIRECT ALL MAIL TO: P. O. BOX 1950 COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA 92628-1950

TELEPHONE (714) 641-5100

FACSIMILE (714) 546-9035 INTERNET WWW.rutan.com

A. W. RUTAN (1880-1972) JAMES B. TUCKER, SR. (1888-1950) MILFORD W. DAHL, SR. (1919-1988) M. RODGER HOWELL (1925-1983)

ROBERT O. OWEN
ADAM N. VOLKERT
JEFFREY A. GOLDFARB
F. KEVIN BRAZIL JEFFREY A. GOLDFARS
F, KEVIN SRAZIL
LAYNE H. MELZER
L. SKI HARRISON
ELISE K. TRAYNUM
LARRY A. CERUTTI
CAROL D. CARITY
PATRICK D. MCCALLA
RICHARD K. HOWELL
JAMES S. WEISZ²
MICHAEL K. SLATTERY
A. PATRICK MUÑOZ
DEBRA DUNN STEEL
DAVID H. HOCHNER
DAN SLATER
PAUL J. SIEVERS
S. DANIEL HARBOTTLE
KENT H. CLAYTON
JOSEPH L. MAGA III
KRAGIG C. KILGER

*A PROFESSIONAL CORPOR

SCOTT R. SANTAGATA ALLEN C. OSTERGAR III JENNIFER WHITE-SPERLING ALLEN C. OSTERGAR III
JENNIFER WHITE-SPERLING
STEVEN J. GOON
DOUGLAS J. DENNINGTON
TREG A. JULANDER
TODD O. LITFIN
KARA S. CARLSON
ERIC L. DUNN
FRED GALANTE
CRISTY G. LOMENZO
JEFFREY T. MELCHING
SEAN P. FARRELL
MARLENE POSE
APRIL LEE WALTER
KAREN ELIZABETH WALTER
KAREN ELIZABETH WALTER
NATALIE SIBBALD DUNDAS
ALISON M. BARBAROSH
JOHN W. HAMILTON JR.
LYNN LOSCHIN
PHILIP J. BLANCHARD
TERENCE J. GALLAGHER

'A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

OF COUNSEL EDWARD D. SYBESMA, JR.° DAVID J. GARIBALDI, III

January 14, 1999

RECEIVED

JAN 1 8 1999

CITY ATTORNEY

Mr. Jerry Scheer City Attorney City of Costa Mesa P.O. Box 1200 Costa Mesa, CA 92628-1200

PHILIP D. KOHN
JOEL D. KUPERBERG
STEVEN A. NICHOLS
THOMAS G. BROCKINGTON
WILLIAM W. WYNDER
EVRIDIKI (VICKI) DALLAS
RANDALL M. BABBUSH
MARY M. GREEN
GREGG AMBER
MICHAEL F. SITZER
THOMAS J. CRANE
MARK B. FRAZIER
PENELOPE PARMES
M. KATHERINE JENSOM

PENELOPE PARMES
M. KATHERINE JIESON
DUKE F. WAHLOUIST
RICHARD G. MONTEVIDEO
LORI SARNER SMITH
ERNEST W. KLATTE III
ELIZABETH L. MARTYN
KIM D. THOMPSON
JAYNE TAYLOR KACER
DAVID B. COSGROVE
HANS VAN LIGTEN
STEPHEN A. ELLIS
MATTHEW K. ROSS
JEFFREY WERTHEIMER

City of Costa Mesa, \$3,910,000 1974 Open Space Bonds

Dear Mr. Scheer:

费

JAMES R. MOORE"
PAUL FREDERIC MARX
RICHARD A., CURNUTT
LEDNARD A., HAMPEL
JOHN B. HURLBUT, JR.
MICHAEL W. IMMELL
MILFORD W. DANL, JR.
THEODORE I. WALLACE, JR."
GILBERT N. KRUGER
JOSEPH D. CARRUTH
RICHARD P., SIMS
JAMES B., O'NEAL
ROBERT C., BRAUN
THOMAS S., SALINGER"
DAVID C., LARSEN"
CLIFFORD E., FRIEDEN
MICHAEL D., RUBIN
IFA G., RIVINDERMAN"
JEFFR WOLCOTT"
TOBERT S., BOWER
DAVID J. ALESHIRE
MARCIA A., FORSYTH
WILLIAM M., MARTICORENA
JAMES E., MOORRIS
WILLIAM J., CAPLAN
MICHAEL T., HORNAK

Pursuant to your request, I retrieved our file for the above issue in which we acted as bond counsel in early-1974. bonds were issued pursuant to Ordinance No. 73-40, which was passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of Costa Mesa on November 19, 1973.

You have asked us to address the following questions:

- May the City of Costa Mesa sell a portion of the open space property acquired from the proceeds of the bonds?
- Are there any particular restrictions on the use of the 2. sale proceeds?

As to the first question, unlike Certificates of Participation and other types of financings in which there is a security interest in the project, general obligation bonds are instead secured by the ad valorem property tax within the City. Thus, there is no lien or other security interest in any particular portion of the facilities financed by the bonds which would need to be released prior to the sale thereof.

Mr. Jerry Scheer City Attorney January 14, 1999 Page 2

With regard to question no. 2, we first examined whether or not the sale of the property would trigger any of the remedial actions required under the so-called "change in use" regulations under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. Since the property in question was acquired for approximately one percent of the original size of the issue, the City's sale of this property into the private sector would not cause the outstanding bonds to become "private activity bonds" as that term is used under the Code or under its predecessor, the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. Thus, it is unnecessary for the City to use the proceeds from the sale for the defeasance and/or redemption of a pro rata portion of the bonds.

We also reviewed the California Government Code to determine whether or not there were any provisions which might govern the disposition of facilities financed by general obligation bond issues. The only section even remotely bearing on this question is Government Code Section 43628, which governs the disposition of unused proceeds of the bonds themselves. This section might be construed to reach "after acquired" proceeds of the bonds in instances such as this, where the original facilities financed are sold prior to the final maturity of the bonds. If Section 43628 were construed in this fashion (which would be purely by implication, since there is nothing specific in the section addressing this question), at most, the City might be required to deposit an amount equivalent to the original acquisition costs (\$43,000) in the Interest and Redemption Fund established in Section 8 of Ordinance No. 73-40.

The application of a portion of the bond proceeds in this fashion would certainly address any question as to the propriety of the disposition of the sale proceeds in terms of unwinding the acquisition of the property as if it never occurred. It also has the salutary benefit of reducing the tax burden on the property owners within the City by an equivalent dollar amount. As I mentioned to you, there is a line of cases in California which states that through the passage of bond measures, such as the two measures which authorize the 1974 Open Space Bonds, creates an "implied contract" running between the voters and the City to utilize the proceeds in the manner described in the bond measure. Although the bond measures did not specifically mention the sites to be acquired, the use of at least a portion of the sale proceeds to "reimburse" the Interest and Redemption Fund would seemingly ameliorate any theoretical "breach" of this implied

Mr. Jerry Scheer City Attorney January 14, 1999 Page 3

contract.

In summary, we do not see any impediment to the sale of the Hamilton Street property and the utilization of the proceeds of the sale for any purpose otherwise authorized by law. We are advised that you have already complied with the provisions of the Government Code which require the City to first offer the property to other public entities and that these other public entities have declined the offer of first refusal. This being the case, we are of the opinion that the City of Costa Mesa is now in a position to sell the property and utilize the proceeds for other public purposes. As noted, however, the City may wish to consider depositing the amount of \$43,000 into the Interest and Redemption Fund for these bonds to remove any potential issue regarding overtaxation or the breach of the implied contract with the voters.

I believe that covers all of the questions that you wished us to address, but should you have any further questions, please feel free to call me at (714) 641-3421 or fax to me a communication at (714) 546-9035.

Sincerely,

Stan Wolcott

lan Wolcon

SW/cls Enclosure (Original file)